REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Currently, claims 20-31, 36-37, 39, 49-50 and 62-63 are pending in this application.

Request for Interview:

In order to advance prosecution of the present application, Applicant respectfully

requests an interview with the Examiner to discuss the present application. Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned upon review of this

Amendment/Response.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103:

Claims 20-26, 30-31, 40-42, 48-49, 51, 53 and 57-60 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yates et al (U.S. '586, hereinafter

"Yates"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to still pending

claims 20-26, 30-31 and 49.

Independent claim 20 and its dependents require, *inter alia*, "the service session

event handler determines respective charges for each particular participant's participation

in the session based on that participant's discrete changes in status including that

individual participant's joining and leaving the session as well as each of the other

participant's changes in status including each of the other participant's joining and

leaving the session."

Independent claim 49 requires, *inter alia*, "a service-generic event handler which

receives the transmitted events in the respective separate event messages from each of

said service-generic service session objects, and processes the events in the respective

event messages from each of the service-generic service session objects, the processing including determining a charge for at least some of the plurality of participants based on that participant's discrete and immediate changes in status including that individual participant's joining and leaving the session as well as each of the other participant's discrete and immediate changes in status including the each of the other participant's joining and leaving the session."

Through the above-identified limitations, charges for a particular session participant is determined not only based on that participant's discrete changes in status from joining and leaving the session, but also each of the other participant's discrete changes in status for joining and leaving the session. Each of these changes in status are indicated in separate messages. If there are suddenly more participants in a service session, the price per session participant at that specific instant can be reduced. This would not be possible in Yates, as each participant would generate a start and stop message only, and thus dynamically registering session related events would not be possible. That is, it would be possible to adjust for the proportion of time per user only after the last user had left the session (which would then allow a "temporal period" to be reported in an event message) in Yates. These features are supported by, for example, pages 22-23 of the originally-filed specification.

As noted above, independent claim 49 requires "a service-generic event handler which receives the transmitted events in the respective separate event messages from each of said service-generic session objects." Multiple service session objects thus transmit event messages to the event handler. This limitation is not disclosed by Yates.

13

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Yates be withdrawn.

Claims 32-39, 50, 55-56 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by "TINA Consortium - Network Resource Architecture Version 3.0" (hereinafter "TINA"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to still pending claims 36-37, 39 and 50.

Independent claim 36 requires, *inter alia*, "wherein a billing record indicating a charge for a particular participant's participation in said service session includes data derived from logically uncombined events transmitted in respective separate event messages indicating respective discrete changes in the session-related status of each of the individual participants' joining and leaving the session indicated in separate messages as well as respective separate messages indicating the respective discrete changes in the session-related status of at least one other participants' joining and leaving of the session indicated in separate messages such that charge indicated for each of the individual participants is dependent on the status of that same individual participant and the status of the at least one other participant." Independent claim 50 requires, *inter alia*, "processing in the service-generic event handler the events contained in the separate event messages, the processing including determining a charge for each of the participants based on that participant's discrete and immediate changes in status including that individual participant's joining and leaving the session as well as at least one of the other participant's discrete and immediate changes in status including the other participant's joining and leaving the session."

14

These limitations are supported by, for example, pages 22-23 of the originally-filed specification. Similar to the discussion above, these features require that charges for a session participant is determined not only on discrete changes of that participant joining and leaving a session, but also at least another participant's joining and leaving the session, these changes being communicated in separate event messages. TINA fails to disclose or even suggest these limitations.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of TINA be withdrawn.

Claims 27, 28, 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yates in view of Lynch-Aired (U.S. '402). Claims 29 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yates in view of Ginzboorg et al (U.S. '051, hereinafter "Ginzboorg"). Claim 47, 52 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yates in view of TINA. None of Lynch-Aired, Ginzboorg and/or TINA remedy the above described deficiencies of Yates. Accordingly, even if these references were combined with Yates as proposed by the Office Action, the combination would not have rendered the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New Claims:

New claims 62-63 have been added to provide additional protection for the invention. New claim 63 requires "wherein the generation of a billing record for a particular participant's participation in said service session is performed as a function

both of event messages indicating discrete changes in the session-related status of that

particular participant and of event messages indicating discrete changes in the session-

related status of at least one of the other participants in said service session, such that the

charge indicated for said particular participant is dependent on its own status during the

service session and the status of said other participant(s) during said service session."

New independent claim 62 requires a similar (but not necessarily identical) feature.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 62-63 are allowable.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and

respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes

that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to

telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____
Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:sl
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4044
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100